

Differential Private Noise Adding Mechanism: Fundamental Theory and its Application*

Jianping He and Lin Cai

Abstract

Differential privacy is a formal mathematical standard for quantifying the degree of that individual privacy in a statistical database is preserved. To guarantee differential privacy, a typical method is adding random noise to the original data for data release. In this paper, we investigate the fundamental theory of differential privacy considering the general random noise adding mechanism, and then apply this framework for privacy analysis of the privacy-preserving consensus algorithm. Specifically, we obtain a necessary and sufficient condition of ϵ -differential privacy, and the sufficient conditions of (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy. This theoretical framework provides a useful and efficient criterion of achieving differential privacy. We utilize them to analyze the privacy of some common random noises and the theory matches with the existing literature for special cases. Applying the theory, differential privacy property of a privacy-preserving consensus algorithm is investigated based on the framework. We obtain the necessary condition and the sufficient condition for the privacy-preserving consensus algorithm, under which differential privacy is achieved, respectively. In addition, it is proved that the average consensus and ϵ -differential privacy cannot be guaranteed simultaneously by any privacy-preserving consensus algorithm.

Index Terms

Differential privacy, Random mechanism, Noise adding process, Average consensus.

* Part of the preliminary result of this work was submitted to IEEE Conference on American Control Conference (ACC), 2017 [1].

The Dept. of Electrical & Computer Engineering at the University of Victoria, BC, Canada jphe@uvic.ca; cai@ece.uvic.ca

I. INTRODUCTION

Differential privacy, a famous and widely used privacy concept, aims to minimize the chances of identifying single records in a release of a large database [2]. Differential privacy means that the presence or absence of any individual data in the database will not affect the statistical information significantly [3]. Thus, the adversary has a low chance to identify the individual's record with released information and arbitrary auxiliary information under differential privacy. In a word, differential privacy has been a formal framework to quantify the degree of that the individual privacy is preserved while releasing useful statistical information about the database [3], [4]. We refer the readers to the survey papers [5], [6] by Dwork et al. for more detailed introduction of differential privacy, including the motivation, background, the important developments of its theories and applications.

There are two kinds of differential privacy concepts which have been widely investigated in the existing literature. The first is named ϵ -differential privacy. The parameter ϵ expresses the privacy cost, and smaller value of ϵ can guarantee stronger privacy. Based on ϵ -differential privacy, an adversary cannot gain any significant information about the data function of any individual agent based on the observation of data output. The standard approach to preserving ϵ -differential privacy is adding random noise following Laplacian distribution to original data for information release [5]. Recently, Geng and Viswanath [3] showed that when the adding random noise follows a staircase distribution, the optimal ϵ -differential privacy can be guaranteed in terms of a general utility-based framework formulated by the authors. The second is named (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy, which is a relaxed notion of privacy. In this privacy definition, the parameter ϵ expresses the privacy cost and δ expresses the probability of violating the privacy cost. For both parameters, smaller values offer stronger privacy guarantees [11]. To preserve this kind of differential privacy, the common approach is adding Gaussian noise to the pure data value for query output.

Therefore, random noise adding mechanism is a widely-used method for differential privacy preserving. The main challenge is to design some special distributions of the adding noises such that differential privacy is guaranteed. For most of the existing work, however, differential privacy is proved for some special noise distributions (e.g., Laplacian and Gaussian), i.e., the distributions of the adding noises is given and fixed. No general and fundamental theory exists

to determine whether differential privacy is guaranteed or not and what kinds of the distributions of the adding noise can guarantee differential privacy. To fill this gap, in this paper, we first investigate the fundamental conditions for the random noise adding mechanism, under which differential privacy can be guaranteed. We thus obtain a theoretical framework of differential privacy, which provides the basic criteria to both kinds of differential privacy. To show this statement, we analyze the well known noise adding mechanisms, e.g., Laplacian and Gaussian. Using our theoretical results, we obtain the same privacy results as those proved in existing works. In addition, we apply the framework to analyze the privacy of the privacy-preserving consensus algorithm, which is a hot topic in control and optimization area recently. The main contributions of this paper are summarized as follows.

- 1) To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to investigate the fundamental conditions of the random noise adding mechanism to guarantee differential privacy. We obtain a necessary and sufficient condition of ϵ -differential privacy, and the sufficient conditions of (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy. Meanwhile, we provide the estimation of the upper bounds of ϵ and σ , respectively.
- 2) We show that the obtained theoretical framework provides efficient and simple criteria of both ϵ -differential privacy and (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy. Specifically, using the obtained results, we prove that Laplacian noise is ϵ -differential private, and Gaussian noise is (ϵ, δ) -differential private, and uniform noise is $(0, \sigma)$ -differential private, consistent with the claims in the existing works. It thus verifies the effectiveness of the proposed theoretical framework.
- 3) We apply the theorems of differential privacy to analyze the privacy of general privacy-preserving consensus algorithm. We obtain the necessary condition and the sufficient condition for the algorithm under which differential privacy is achieved. We prove that it is impossible to achieve the average consensus and ϵ -differential privacy simultaneously.

In summary, using the theories obtained in this paper, differential privacy of the randomized mechanism or privacy-preserving consensus algorithm can be easily determined by checking the conditions in the theories. Different from the existing work, the proposed framework can be adopted to the randomized mechanism with any distributions.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II formulates the problem. In

Section III, we provide basic theoretical results of differential privacy. Section IV studies the application on privacy-preserving consensus algorithm. The related works are given in Section V. Conclusions are summarized in Section VI.

II. PRELIMINARY AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. Preliminary

Let $V = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ be the set of nodes (users). By referring to [6], we introduce the definitions of adjacency and differential privacy, respectively, as follows.

Definition 2.1 (σ -adjacency): Given $\sigma \in \mathbf{R}^+$, the state vector x and y are σ -adjacent if, for some $i_0 \in V$,

$$|x_i - y_i| \leq \begin{cases} \sigma & \text{if } i = i_0 \\ 0 & \text{if } i \neq i_0 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

for $i \in V$, where $x, y \in \mathbf{R}^n$.

From the above definition, it follows that a pair of σ -adjacent vectors x and y have at most one different element, and the difference is no more than σ . For example, $x = [0, 1]$ and $y = [1, 1]$ are 1-adjacent vectors.

Definition 2.2 ((ϵ, δ) -differential privacy): A randomized mechanism $\mathcal{A}$ with domain Ω is (ϵ, δ) -differentially private if, for any pair x and y ($x, y \in \Omega$) of σ -adjacent state vector and any set $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \text{Range}(\mathcal{A})$, where $\text{Range}(\mathcal{A})$ is the domain of the output under mechanism $\mathcal{A}$,

$$\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x) \in \mathcal{O}\} \leq e^\epsilon \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y) \in \mathcal{O}\} + \delta. \quad (2)$$

In the above privacy definition, there are two key parameters, ϵ and δ , which express the privacy cost and the probability of violating the privacy cost, respectively. For both of these parameters, smaller values offer stronger privacy guarantees. If $\delta = 0$, we say that $\mathcal{A}$ is ϵ -differentially private, which provides a stronger privacy than (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy.

Table I summarizes a few important notations in this paper for easy reference.

B. Problem Formulation

General Random Mechanism: We consider a general random noise adding mechanism. Assume that the randomized mechanism $\mathcal{A} : \Omega \rightarrow \text{Range}(\mathcal{A})$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{A}(x) = x + \theta, \quad \forall x \in \Omega, \quad (3)$$

where $\theta \in \Theta$ is a random noise vector with $f_{\theta_i}(z)$ as the PDF of its i -th element θ_i , and $\Theta \subseteq R^n$. Then, we have $\text{Range}(\mathcal{A}) = \Omega \oplus \Theta$, where $\oplus$ denotes the plus between two set, i.e., any element in $\text{Range}(\mathcal{A})$ will equal to the sum of two elements respectively in sets Ω and Θ . The random mechanism $\mathcal{A}$ defined in (3) is a general noise adding mechanism, where x could be substituted by a general invertible function of x with Lipschitz condition and θ could also be a function of some random variables¹.

Problem of Interests: The goal of this paper is to investigate the following two questions theoretically: i) what are the sufficient and necessary conditions of differential privacy considering the randomized mechanism $\mathcal{A}$ defined in (3); and ii) how to extend and apply the obtained results to the dynamic random mechanism. We apply it to the privacy-preserving consensus algorithm, which is an important distributed iteration algorithm in the control area. We will solve these two problems in the following two sections, respectively.

III. FUNDAMENTAL THEORY OF DIFFERENTIAL PRIVACY

In this section, we obtain a theoretical framework of differential privacy. First, the basic conditions of differential privacy considering $\mathcal{A}$ defined in (3) are obtained, followed by the estimations of the privacy parameters. Then, we show that the framework provides efficient criteria of differential privacy through case studies, where the Laplacian, Gaussian and Uniform noises are investigated, respectively, by using the developed theoretical framework.

A. Necessary and Sufficient Condition

In this subsection, a necessary and sufficient condition of ϵ -differentially private is obtained, which is given in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1: $\mathcal{A}$ is ϵ -differentially private if and only if (iff) the following two conditions hold,

¹ For example, we consider a more general mechanism as follows

$$\mathcal{A}(x) = g(x) + h(\theta), \forall x \in \Omega, \theta \in \Theta,$$

where $g(x)$ is a function of x satisfying $|g(x) - g(y)| \leq L|x - y|$ (where L is a Lipschitz constant) and $g(x) \neq g(y)$ when $x \neq y$ and $h(\theta)$ is a function of θ . We can use a similar analytical approach given in this paper to analyze differential privacy of the above mechanism.

TABLE I
IMPORTANT NOTATIONS

Symbol	Definition
x, y	a pair of σ -adjacent n dimensional vector
$\mathcal{A}$	a random mechanism
σ	a parameter expressing the adjacency between vectors
ϵ	a parameter expressing the privacy cost
δ	a parameter expressing the probability of the violating the privacy
$\mathcal{O}$	a subset of $\text{Range}(\mathcal{A})$
$\mathcal{O}_i$	the set of i -th column element of $\mathcal{O}$
$\text{Range}(\mathcal{A})$	the domain of the output under mechanism $\mathcal{A}$
$f_{\theta_i}(z)$	the probability density function of random variable θ_i
μ	the function of Lebesgue measure
Φ_i^0	the zero point set of the function $f_{\theta_i}(z)$
W	the weight matrix in a consensus algorithm
$\bar{x}$	the average value of all node states

c1: zero measure of the zero-point set, i.e.,

$$\mu \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n \Phi_i^0 \right) = 0 \quad (4)$$

where $\Phi_i^0 = \{z | f_{\theta_i}(z) = 0, z \in \mathbf{R}\}$ is the zero point set and $\mu(\cdot)$ is the Lebesgue measure;

c2: there exists a positive constant c_b such that

$$\sup_{\hat{\sigma} \in [-\sigma, \sigma], f_{\theta_i}(z) \neq 0} \frac{f_{\theta_i + \hat{\sigma}}(z)}{f_{\theta_i}(z)} \leq c_b, \quad (5)$$

for $\forall i \in V$, where the acnodes of both $f_{\theta_i + \hat{\sigma}}$ and $f_{\theta_i}(z)$ are not considered.

Proof: $\Leftarrow$: We prove the necessity by contradiction.

First, we prove that (4) is a necessary condition. Assume that $\mu \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n \Phi_i^0 \right) > 0$, which means that there exists at least one $i_0 \in V$ with $\mu \left(\Phi_{i_0}^0 \right) > 0$. Thus, there should exist an continuous interval $[a, b]$ such that

$$f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z) = 0, \quad \forall z \in [a, b], \quad (6)$$

and

$$f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z) > 0, \quad \text{for } z > b, \quad (7)$$

or $f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z) > 0$ for $z < a$ ².

For σ -adjacent state vectors x and y , we let $x_{i_0} = y_{i_0} - \sigma$ and $x_i = y_i$ (when $i \neq i_0$), where $\sigma < b - a$. Then, with (3), we have $\mathcal{A}(x_{i_0}) = x_{i_0} + \theta$ and $\mathcal{A}(y_{i_0}) = y_{i_0} + \theta$. Define a subset $\mathcal{O}_{i_0} = [y_{i_0} + a, y_{i_0} + b]$, which satisfies $\mathcal{O}_{i_0} \subseteq \text{Range}(\mathcal{A}(x_{i_0}))$. From (6) and (7), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x_{i_0}) \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}\} &= \int_{y_{i_0}+a}^{y_{i_0}+b} f_{x_{i_0}+\theta_{i_0}}(z) \mathrm{d}z \\ &= \int_{y_{i_0}+a-x_{i_0}}^{y_{i_0}+b-x_{i_0}} f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z) \mathrm{d}z = \int_{a+\sigma}^{b+\sigma} f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z) \mathrm{d}z \\ &= \int_{a+\sigma}^b f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z) \mathrm{d}z + \int_b^{b+\sigma} f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z) \mathrm{d}z \\ &= \int_b^{b+\sigma} f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z) \mathrm{d}z > 0, \end{aligned}$$

while

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y_{i_0}) \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}\} &= \int_{y_{i_0}+a}^{y_{i_0}+b} f_{y_{i_0}+\theta_{i_0}}(z) \mathrm{d}z \\ &= \int_a^b f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z) \mathrm{d}z = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x) \in \mathcal{O}\}}{\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y) \in \mathcal{O}\}} \\ &= \frac{\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x_{i_0}) \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}\} \prod_{i=1, i \neq i_0}^n \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x_i) \in \mathcal{O}_i\}}{\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y_{i_0}) \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}\} \prod_{i=1, i \neq i_0}^n \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y_i) \in \mathcal{O}_i\}} \\ &= \frac{\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x_{i_0}) \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}\}}{\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y_{i_0}) \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}\}} = \infty, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $\mathcal{O}_i$ is the domain of i -th element in $\mathcal{O}$. It contradicts to the definition of ϵ -differential privacy. Thus, one obtains that (4) is a necessary condition if $\mathcal{A}$ is ϵ -differentially private.

Second, we prove that (5) is also a necessary condition. Suppose that

$$\sup_{\hat{\sigma} \in [-\sigma, \sigma], f_{\theta_i}(z) \neq 0} \frac{f_{\theta_i+\hat{\sigma}}(z)}{f_{\theta_i}(z)} = \infty.$$

Then, for any given large constant M , there exist z_0 and $\hat{\sigma} \in [-\sigma, \sigma]$ such that $f_{\theta_i}(z_0) \neq 0$ and

$$\frac{f_{\theta_i}(z_0 + \hat{\sigma})}{f_{\theta_i}(z_0)} \geq M.$$

²Without loss of generality, suppose $f_{\theta_i}(z) > 0$ holds for $z > b$ in the following proof.

Since (4) holds and the measure of the acnodes is also zero, we can ignore these two cases when we calculate the probability. We thus can assume that $f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z)$ is a continuous function in a small interval among z_0 and among $z_0 + \hat{\sigma}$. Then, based on the definition of a continuous function, there exists a small positive constant ε_0 such that

$$\max_{z \in [z_0, z_0 + \varepsilon_0]} f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z) \leq 2f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z_0)$$

and

$$\min_{z \in [z_0 + \hat{\sigma}, z_0 + \hat{\sigma} + \varepsilon_0]} f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z) \geq (M - 1)f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z_0).$$

Then, we construct a pair of $\hat{\sigma}$ -adjacent state vector x and y with $x_{i_0} = y_{i_0} - \hat{\sigma}$ and $x_i = y_i$ (when $i \neq i_0$). Define the set $\mathcal{O}_{i_0}^0 = [y_{i_0} + z_0, y_{i_0} + z_0 + \varepsilon_0]$, where $\varepsilon_0 \leq \hat{\sigma}$. Based on (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x_{i_0}) \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}^0\}}{\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y_{i_0}) \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}^0\}} &= \frac{\int_{y_{i_0} + z_0}^{y_{i_0} + z_0 + \varepsilon_0} f_{x_{i_0} + \theta_{i_0}}(z) \mathrm{d}z}{\int_{y_{i_0} + z_0}^{y_{i_0} + z_0 + \varepsilon_0} f_{y_{i_0} + \theta_{i_0}}(z) \mathrm{d}z} \\ &= \frac{\int_{z_0 + \hat{\sigma}}^{z_0 + \hat{\sigma} + \varepsilon_0} f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z) \mathrm{d}z}{\int_{z_0}^{z_0 + \varepsilon_0} f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z) \mathrm{d}z} \\ &\geq \frac{(M - 1)f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z_0)\varepsilon_0}{2f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z_0)\varepsilon_0} \\ &\geq \frac{(M - 1)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, similar to (8), we infer that

$$\frac{\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x) \in \mathcal{O}\}}{\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y) \in \mathcal{O}\}} \geq \frac{(M - 1)}{2}.$$

Note that M could be an any large constant, which implies that $\mathcal{A}$ is not ϵ -differentially private. Hence, (13) also a necessary condition, if, $\mathcal{A}$ is ϵ -differentially private.

$\Rightarrow$: Next, we prove the sufficiency. Since (4) holds, the cases that $f_{\theta_i}(z) = 0, \forall i \in V$ and the acnodes are ignored when we calculate a probability. Let $\mathcal{O}_i$ be the domain/set of i -th element in $\mathcal{O}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Under (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x) \in \mathcal{O}\} &= \Pr\{x + \theta \in \mathcal{O}\} \\ &= \Pr\{x_{i_0} + \theta_{i_0} \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}\} \prod_{i=1, i \neq i_0}^n \Pr\{x_i + \theta_i \in \mathcal{O}_i\} \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y) \in \mathcal{O}\} &= \Pr\{y + \theta \in \mathcal{O}\} \\ &= \Pr\{y_{i_0} + \theta_{i_0} \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}\} \prod_{i=1, i \neq i_0}^n \Pr\{y_i + \theta_i \in \mathcal{O}_i\}.\end{aligned}\quad (10)$$

Since $x_i = y_i, i \neq i_0$, we have

$$\prod_{i=1, i \neq i_0}^n \Pr\{x_i + \theta_i \in \mathcal{O}_i\} = \prod_{i=1, i \neq i_0}^n \Pr\{y_i + \theta_i \in \mathcal{O}_i\}.\quad (11)$$

Meanwhile, with the condition of c_2 , it follows

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr\{x_{i_0} + \theta_{i_0} \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}\} &= \oint_{\mathcal{O}_{i_0}} f_{x_{i_0} + \theta_{i_0}}(z) dz \\ &= \oint_{\mathcal{O}_{i_0}} f_{y_{i_0} - \hat{\sigma} + \theta_{i_0}}(z) dz \leq \oint_{\mathcal{O}_{i_0}} c_b f_{y_{i_0} + \theta_{i_0}}(z) dz \\ &= c_b \Pr\{y_{i_0} + \theta_{i_0} \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}\},\end{aligned}\quad (12)$$

where we have used the fact of (5). Substituting (11) and (12) into (9) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x) \in \mathcal{O}\} &\leq c_b \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y) \in \mathcal{O}\} \\ &= e^{\log(c_b)} \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y) \in \mathcal{O}\}\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. ■

From the proof of the above theorem, it is easy to obtain the following corollary, which provides an upper bound estimation of the parameter ϵ in ϵ -differential privacy.

Corollary 3.2: If the conditions c_1 and c_2 hold, $\mathcal{A}$ is ϵ -differential private, where ϵ satisfies $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \log(c_b)$.

Note that a smaller ϵ provides a stronger privacy guarantee. From the above corollary, we note that $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ if $c_b \rightarrow 1$, i.e., a stronger privacy can be guaranteed when c_b becomes smaller. Then, we consider a kind of random distribution which can guarantee any small ϵ -differential private. For any $c_b > 1$, we construct a kind of staircase-shaped PDF for each random variable used in the noise adding mechanism, such that the conditions c_1 and c_2 can be satisfied, which is given by

$$f(z) = \begin{cases} \frac{1-\varrho}{2} \varrho^k, & z \in [k, k+1]; \\ \frac{1-\varrho}{2}, & z \in [-1, 1]; \\ \frac{1-\varrho}{2} \varrho^k, & z \in [-k-1, -k], \end{cases}$$

where $\varrho \in (0, 1)$ and k is a positive integer. A staircase-shaped PDF is shown as in Fig. 2. For




Fig. 1. An example of the staircase-shaped PDF.

the above staircase-shaped function $f(z)$, we obtain that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f(z) dz = (1 - \varrho) + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - \varrho}{2} \varrho^k = 1,$$

and it thus could be a PDF function for a random variable. In this case, when $\sigma \leq 1$, it follows that

$$\sup_{\hat{\sigma} \in [-\sigma, \sigma], f_{\theta_i}(z) \neq 0} \frac{f_{\theta_i + \hat{\sigma}}(z)}{f_{\theta_i}(z)} = \frac{1}{\varrho}.$$

Note that ϱ could be any value in $(0, 1)$, which means that c_b could be any value in $(1, \infty)$ by setting $\varrho = \frac{1}{c_b}$. Hence, for any small $\epsilon > 0$, we can find a staircase-shaped PDF for the adding noise such that $\mathcal{A}$ is ϵ -differentially private. It also should be pointed out that the staircase-shaped PDFs are proved to be the optimal distribution for noise adding mechanism in terms of utility-maximization [3], [4], where the utility is a specific cost function depending on the noise added to the query output (i.e., the different value of the adding noise will cause different cost for the query output function).

Next, we provide another necessary condition and sufficient condition of ϵ -differentially private, respectively.

Theorem 3.3: If $\mathcal{A}$ is ϵ -differentially private, then for $\forall i \in V$, there $\nexists c_o \in (-\infty, +\infty)$, such that

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow c_0} f_{\theta_i}(z) = 0. \quad (13)$$

Proof: Suppose that there exists a bounded constant $c_0 \in (-\infty, +\infty)$, s.t., $\lim_{z \rightarrow c_0} f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z) = 0$. Since (4) holds, we can let $f_{\theta_{i_0}}(c_0) = 0$ and suppose that $f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z)$ is a continuous function in

a small interval among c_0 . Then, there exists an interval $[c_0, c_1]$ and a small $\hat{\sigma} \leq \frac{c_1 - c_0}{2}$ such that

$$\max_{z \in [c_0, c_0 + \hat{\sigma}]} f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z) \leq \hat{\epsilon}(\hat{\sigma})$$

and

$$\max_{z \in [c_0 + \hat{\sigma}, c_1]} f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z) > \hat{\epsilon}(\hat{\sigma})$$

where $\hat{\epsilon}(\hat{\sigma})$ satisfies $\lim_{\hat{\sigma} \rightarrow 0} \hat{\epsilon}(\hat{\sigma}) = 0$. Then, we construct a pair of $\hat{\sigma}$ -adjacent state vector x and y with $x_{i_0} = y_{i_0} - \hat{\sigma}$ and $x_i = y_i$ (when $i \neq i_0$). Define the set $\mathcal{O}_{i_0}^k = [y_{i_0} + c_0, y_{i_0} + c_0 + \hat{\sigma}(k)]$, where $\hat{\sigma}(k) \leq \hat{\sigma}$. Based on (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x_{i_0}) \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}^k\}}{\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y_{i_0}) \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}^k\}} &= \frac{\int_{y_{i_0} + c_0}^{y_{i_0} + c_0 + \hat{\sigma}(k)} f_{x_{i_0} + \theta_{i_0}}(z) dz}{\int_{y_{i_0} + c_0}^{y_{i_0} + c_0 + \hat{\sigma}(k)} f_{y_{i_0} + \theta_{i_0}}(z) dz} \\ &= \frac{\int_{c_0 + \hat{\sigma}}^{c_0 + \hat{\sigma} + \hat{\sigma}(k)} f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z) dz}{\int_{c_0}^{c_0 + \hat{\sigma}(k)} f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z) dz} \\ &\geq \frac{\hat{\epsilon}(\hat{\sigma}) \hat{\sigma}(k)}{\hat{\epsilon}(\hat{\sigma}(k)) \hat{\sigma}(k)} \geq \frac{\hat{\epsilon}(\hat{\sigma})}{\hat{\epsilon}(\hat{\sigma}(k))}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\hat{\sigma}(k) \rightarrow 0$, one obtains

$$\lim_{\hat{\sigma}(k) \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x_{i_0}) \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}^k\}}{\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y_{i_0}) \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}^k\}} \geq \lim_{\hat{\sigma}(k) \rightarrow 0} \frac{\hat{\epsilon}(\hat{\sigma})}{\hat{\epsilon}(\hat{\sigma}(k))} = +\infty,$$

which implies that $\mathcal{A}$ is not ϵ -differentially private. It leads to a contradiction. Thus, (13) is a necessary condition when $\mathcal{A}$ is ϵ -differentially private, which completes the proof. $\blacksquare$

For the above necessary condition, it is actually a necessary condition of condition c_2 , which can be easily proved by contradiction. This further explains why the condition in the above theorem is necessary to ϵ -differential privacy.

Theorem 3.4: $\mathcal{A}$ is ϵ -differentially private, if, for $\forall i \in V$, there exists a positive constant c_b such that

$$\sup_{\hat{\sigma} \in [-\sigma, \sigma]} \frac{f_{\theta_i + \hat{\sigma}}(z)}{f_{\theta_i}(z)} \leq c_b. \quad (14)$$

Proof: Note that if (14) can guarantee both conditions c_1 and c_2 to be satisfied, then this theorem is proved from Theorem 3.1.

First, we prove that (14) guarantees that condition c_2 is satisfied. By comparing (5) and (14), we note that the constraint $f_{\theta_i}(z) \neq 0$ in (5) is removed in (14), which means that (14) provides a more general result than (5). Hence, one infers that condition c_2 is guaranteed by (14) directly.

Then, we prove that (14) can also guarantee condition c_1 . First, suppose that c_1 is not true, then there exists a continuous interval such that $f_{\theta_i}(z) = 0$ for z in this interval. Second, since $f_{\theta_i}(z)$ is a PDF of a random variable, we have $f_{\theta_i}(z) \geq 0$ and $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_{\theta_i}(z) dz = 1$. Thus, there exists a continuous interval such that $f_{\theta_i}(z) > 0$ holds in this interval. Then, we further infer that there exist two continuous intervals (a, b) and (b, c) such that $f_{\theta_i}(z) = 0$ for $z \in (a, b)$ and $f_{\theta_i}(z) > 0$ for $z \in (b, c)$. It means that

$$\sup_{\hat{\sigma} \in [-\sigma, \sigma]} \frac{f_{\theta_i + \hat{\sigma}}(z)}{f_{\theta_i}(z)} \geq \sup_{\hat{\sigma} \in [-\sigma, \sigma]} \frac{f_{\theta_i}(b + \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{2})}{f_{\theta_i}(b - \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{2})} = \infty, \quad (15)$$

which leads to a contradiction. Therefore, we have that c_1 is also true under (14).

We thus have completed the proof. ■

From the above proof, we know that (14) is a stronger condition than the conditions c_1 and c_2 . Thus, (14) is only a sufficient but not a necessary condition.

B. Sufficient Condition for (ϵ, δ) -Differential Privacy

In this subsection, we study the relaxed differential privacy, named (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy. We obtain the sufficient conditions to guarantee that $\mathcal{A}$ provides (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy, followed by the estimations of both the parameters ϵ and δ .

Theorem 3.5: If (5) holds, then $\mathcal{A}$ is (ϵ, δ) -differentially private, where ϵ and δ satisfy $\epsilon \leq \log(c_b)$ and

$$\delta \leq \max_{i \in V} \oint_{\Phi_i^0} f_{\theta_i}(z + \sigma) dz, \quad (16)$$

respectively, and if (4) holds, we have $\delta = 0$, i.e., $\mathcal{A}$ is ϵ -differentially private.

Proof: Similarly, assume the σ -Adjacency state vectors x and y satisfy $y_{i_0} = x_{i_0} + \sigma$ and $x_i = y_i, i \neq i_0$, and define $\mathcal{O}_l$ to be the l -th column element set of $\mathcal{O}$ for $l = 1, \dots, n$. Then, we have that (9), (10) and (11) still hold true.

First, we consider the case that $\mu(\cup_{i \in V} \Phi_i^0) > 0$. Since the non-zero measure of the zero point

set, (12) no longer holds true but we can obtain the following equation,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\{x_{i_0} + \theta_{i_0} \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}\} &= \oint_{\mathcal{O}_{i_0}} f_{x_{i_0} + \theta_{i_0}}(z) dz \\
&= \oint_{\mathcal{O}_{i_0}} f_{y_{i_0} - \sigma + \theta_{i_0}}(z) dz \leq \oint_{\mathcal{O}_{i_0}} c_b f_{y_{i_0} + \theta_{i_0}}(z) dz \\
&+ \oint_{\{\Phi_{i_0}^0 + y_{i_0}\} \cap \mathcal{O}_{i_0}} f_{y_{i_0} - \sigma + \theta_{i_0}}(z) dz \\
&\leq c_b \Pr\{y_{i_0} + \theta_{i_0} \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}\} + \oint_{\{\Phi_{i_0}^0 + y_{i_0}\}} f_{y_{i_0} - \sigma + \theta_{i_0}}(z) dz \\
&\leq c_b \Pr\{y_{i_0} + \theta_{i_0} \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}\} + \oint_{\Phi_{i_0}^0} f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z + \sigma) dz,
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where we have used the fact that $f_{\theta_{i_0} - \sigma}(z) = f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z + \sigma)$. Then, one infers from (9), (10), (11) and (17) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x) \in \mathcal{O}\} &= \prod_{l=1}^n \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x_l) \in \mathcal{O}_l\} \\
&= \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x_{i_0}) \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}\} \prod_{l=1, l \neq i_0}^n \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x_l) \in \mathcal{O}_l\} \\
&\leq c_b \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y_{i_0}) \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}\} \prod_{l=1, l \neq i_0}^n \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y_l) \in \mathcal{O}_l\} \\
&+ \oint_{\Phi_{i_0}^0} f_{\theta_{i_0}}(z + \sigma) dz \prod_{l=1, l \neq i_0}^n \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y_l) \in \mathcal{O}_l\} \\
&\leq c_b \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y) \in \mathcal{O}\} + \max_{i \in V} \oint_{\Phi_i^0} f_{\theta_i}(z + \sigma) dz,
\end{aligned}$$

which means that $\mathcal{A}$ is (ϵ, δ) -differentially private.

Next, if $\mu(\cup_{i \in V} \Phi_i^0) = 0$, we have that $\mu(\Phi_i^0) = 0$ holds for $\forall i \in V$. Then, we obtain that

$$\delta = \max_{i \in V} \oint_{\Phi_i^0} f_{\theta_i}(z + \sigma) dz = 0,$$

i.e., $\mathcal{A}$ is ϵ -differentially private. ■

In the above theorem, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\oint_{\Phi_i^0} f_{\theta_i}(z + \sigma) dz &\leq \oint_{\Phi_i^0 \cap \{\mathbf{R} - \{\Phi_i^0 + \sigma\}\}} f_{\theta_i}(z + \sigma) dz \\
&\leq \max_{\Phi \subset \mathbf{R}, \mu(\Phi) = \mu(\Phi_i^0 \cap \{\mathbf{R} - \{\Phi_i^0 + \sigma\}\})} \oint_{\Phi} f_{\theta_i}(z) dz.
\end{aligned}$$

It means that δ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &\leq \max_{\Phi \subset \mathbf{R}, \mu(\Phi) = \mu(\Phi_i^0 \cap \{\mathbf{R} - \{\Phi_i^0 + \sigma\}\}), i \in V} \oint_{\Phi} f_{\theta_i}(z) dz \\ &\leq \max_{i \in V} \left[\mu(\Phi_i^0 \cap \{\mathbf{R} - \{\Phi_i^0 + \sigma\}\}) \sup_{z \in \mathbf{R}} f_{\theta_i}(z) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Meanwhile, we have

$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \mu(\Phi_i^0 \cap \{\mathbf{R} - \{\Phi_i^0 + \sigma\}\}) = 0.$$

Hence, when the PDF of the adding noise is given, we have

$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} \delta = 0,$$

i.e., the smaller σ -adjacency vectors can guarantee smaller δ for (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy.

From Theorem 3.5, it is known that (5) is a sufficient condition of (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy. However, it should be pointed out that (5) is not a necessary condition of (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy (though it is a necessary condition of ϵ -differential privacy). A contradict example is Gaussian noise, which is (ϵ, δ) -differentially private noise [3], [5], but (5) no longer holds for Gaussian noise. The detailed analysis will be given in the next subsection. Then, we give the other useful sufficient condition of (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy as follows, which can be used to prove that Gaussian noise is (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy.

Theorem 3.6: Let $\Theta = \Theta_0 \cup \Theta_1$. Assume that

$$\oint_{\Theta_0} f_{\theta_i}(z) dz \leq \delta, \forall i \in V \quad (19)$$

and (5) holds when $\theta \in \Theta_1$, i.e.,

$$\sup_{\hat{\sigma} \in [-\sigma, \sigma], \theta \in \Theta_1} \frac{f_{\theta_i + \hat{\sigma}}(z)}{f_{\theta_i}(z)} \leq c_b. \quad (20)$$

Then, $\mathcal{A}$ is (ϵ, δ) -differentially private, where $\epsilon \leq \log(c_b)$.

Proof: Given any σ -adjacent state vectors x and y satisfying $x_{i_0} = y_{i_0} - \sigma$ and $x_i = y_i$ (when $i \neq i_0$), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x) \in \mathcal{O}\} &= \prod_{l=1}^n \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x_l) \in \mathcal{O}_l\} \\
&= \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x_{i_0}) \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}\} \prod_{l=1, l \neq i_0}^n \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x_l) \in \mathcal{O}_l\} \\
&= [\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x_{i_0}) \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0} | \theta \in \Theta_0\} + \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x_{i_0}) \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0} | \theta \in \Theta_1\}] \\
&\quad \times \prod_{l=1, l \neq i_0}^n \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y_l) \in \mathcal{O}_l\} \\
&\leq c_b \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y_{i_0}) \in \mathcal{O}_{i_0}\} \prod_{l=1, l \neq i_0}^n \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y_l) \in \mathcal{O}_l\} \\
&\quad + \oint_{\Theta_0} f_{\theta_i}(z) dz \prod_{l=1, l \neq i_0}^n \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y_l) \in \mathcal{O}_l\} \\
&\leq c_b \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y) \in \mathcal{O}\} + \delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have completed the proof. ■

Considering the conditions in Theorem 3.6, we note that for any kinds of noise random distribution, we have

$$\lim_{\mu(\Theta_0) \rightarrow \mu(\Theta)} \oint_{\Theta_0} f_{\theta_i}(z) dz = 1,$$

and

$$\lim_{\mu(\Theta_1) \rightarrow 0} \sup_{\hat{\sigma} \in [-\sigma, \sigma], \theta \in \Theta_1} \frac{f_{\theta_i + \hat{\sigma}}(z)}{f_{\theta_i}(z)} = 1.$$

Hence, it follows from Theorem 3.6 that using any kinds of random noise, $\mathcal{A}$ is $(0, 1)$ -differentially private. This can also be followed from the truth that

$$\Pr\{\mathcal{A}(x) \in \mathcal{O}\} - \Pr\{\mathcal{A}(y) \in \mathcal{O}\} \leq 1$$

holds for any kinds of noise adding mechanism (because $0 \leq \Pr\{\cdot\} \leq 1$ always holds true). Thus, it is meaningless to consider a $(0, 1)$ -differentially private mechanism, since it can be satisfied by any random distributions. Note that if $\Theta = \Theta_0(k) \cup \Theta_1(k)$ and $\Theta_0(k) \subset \Theta_0(k+1)$,

where $\Theta_1(\infty) = \Theta$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \oint_{\Theta_0(k)} f_{\theta_i}(z) dz &\leq \oint_{\Theta_0(k+1)} f_{\theta_i}(z) dz \\ &\leq \oint_{\Theta_0(\infty)} f_{\theta_i}(z) dz = 1 \end{aligned}$$

while

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\hat{\sigma} \in [-\sigma, \sigma], \theta \in \Theta_1(k)} \frac{f_{\theta_i + \hat{\sigma}}(z)}{f_{\theta_i}(z)} &\geq \sup_{\hat{\sigma} \in [-\sigma, \sigma], \theta \in \Theta_1(k+1)} \frac{f_{\theta_i + \hat{\sigma}}(z)}{f_{\theta_i}(z)} \\ &\geq \sup_{\hat{\sigma} \in [-\sigma, \sigma], \theta \in \Theta_1(\infty)} \frac{f_{\theta_i + \hat{\sigma}}(z)}{f_{\theta_i}(z)} = 1, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $\Theta_1(\infty) = \emptyset$. It means that there exists an increasing sequence $\delta(k)$ and an decreasing sequence $\epsilon(k) = \log(c(k))$ satisfying $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \delta(k) = 1$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon(k) = 0$, respectively, such that $(\epsilon(k), \delta(k))$ -differential privacy is guaranteed by $\mathcal{A}$. However, it should be pointed out that different noise distribution can guarantee the different smallest δ and different corresponding ϵ of (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy. In Theorem 3.5, the estimation of the upper bounds for δ and ϵ can be tighten for some special distributions (e.g., Uniform distribution), which will be illustrated in the following subsection.

C. Case Studies

From the above two theorems, it is not difficult to determine whether the added noise can guarantee differential privacy of a random mechanism or not. In the following, we analyze differential privacy of some common random noises, including Laplacian, Gaussian and Uniform distribution noise.

First, we consider the Laplacian noise adding mechanism. Assume that the PDF is $f_{\theta_i}(z) = \frac{1}{2b} e^{-\frac{|z-a|}{b}}$, where a and b are two constants. We check the conditions c_1 and c_2 , respectively. From Fig. 2, it is clear to see that c_1 holds true due to the continuous and non-zero of the PDF of Laplacian noise. Then, note that for $\forall \hat{\sigma} \in [-\sigma, \sigma]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{f_{\theta_i + \hat{\sigma}}(z)}{f_{\theta_i}(z)} \right| &= \frac{\frac{1}{2b} e^{-\frac{|z - \hat{\sigma} - a|}{b}}}{\frac{1}{2b} e^{-\frac{|z - a|}{b}}} \\ &= e^{\frac{|z - a| - |z - \hat{\sigma} - a|}{b}} \leq e^{\frac{|\sigma|}{b}}. \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 2. Laplacian noise: ϵ -differentially private.

It means that c_2 condition also holds true. Hence, from Theorem 3.1, it follows that Laplacian noise is an ϵ -differentially private noise, which is consistent with the existing result in [3], [5], [6].

Then, we consider Gaussian noise. Assume that the PDF of the noise is $f_{\theta_i}(z) = \frac{1}{b\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-\frac{(z-a)^2}{2b^2}}$. Similarly, one infers that c_1 holds true for Gaussian noise. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{f_{\theta_i+\hat{\sigma}}(z)}{f_{\theta_i}(z)} \right| &= \frac{\frac{1}{b\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-\frac{(z-\hat{\sigma}-a)^2}{2b^2}}}{\frac{1}{b\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-\frac{(z-a)^2}{2b^2}}} = e^{\frac{(z-a)^2 - (z-\hat{\sigma}-a)^2}{2b^2}} \\ &= e^{\frac{\hat{\sigma}(2z-\hat{\sigma}-2a)}{2b^2}}, \end{aligned}$$

which means that

$$\sup_{\hat{\sigma} \in [-\sigma, \sigma], f_{\theta_i}(z) \neq 0} \frac{f_{\theta_i+\hat{\sigma}}(z)}{f_{\theta_i}(z)} \geq \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} e^{\frac{\hat{\sigma}(2z-\hat{\sigma}-2a)}{2b^2}} = \infty.$$

Hence, from Theorem 3.1, it follows that Gaussian noise is not an ϵ -differentially private noise.

However, as shown in Fig. 3, there exists a large constant M such that ϵ is bounded by

$$\epsilon \leq \ln(\max e^{\frac{\hat{\sigma}(2z-\hat{\sigma}-2a)}{2b^2}}) \leq \frac{\sigma(2M-\sigma)}{2b^2},$$

for $z \in [-M, M]$, and δ is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &\leq \oint_{(-\infty, -M] \cup [M, \infty)} f_{\theta_i}(z) dz \\ &= \frac{1}{b\sqrt{2\pi}} \oint_{(-\infty, -M] \cup [M, \infty)} e^{-\frac{(z-a)^2}{2b^2}} dz, \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 3. Gaussian noise: (ϵ, δ) -differentially private.

which is a small value. It means that the conditions in Theorem 3.6 can be satisfied. Thus, we infer that Gaussian noise is an (ϵ, δ) -differentially private noise. These results of Gaussian noise are consistent with the existing results in [3], [5].

Lastly, consider the uniform distribution noise with its PDF as $\frac{1}{b-a}$. Clearly, the c_1 is not true due to the infinite measure of the zero-point set. Hence, uniform distribution is not an ϵ -differentially private noise. Then, we check the conditions in Theorem 3.5. As shown in Fig. 4, it is found that for an uniform distribution noise

$$\sup_{\hat{\sigma} \in [-\sigma, \sigma], f_{\theta_i}(z) \neq 0} \frac{f_{\theta_i+\hat{\sigma}}(z)}{f_{\theta_i}(z)} = \frac{\frac{1}{b-a}}{\frac{1}{b-a}} = 1$$

and

$$\max_{i \in V} \oint_{\Phi_i^0} f_{\theta_i}(z + \sigma) dz = \frac{\sigma}{b-a}.$$

It means that the upper bounds of both ϵ and δ in Theorem 3.5 are tight. Thus, one infers that uniform noise is an (ϵ, δ) -differentially private, where $\epsilon = 0$ and $\delta = \frac{\sigma}{b-a}$. Then, it is noted that δ is a decreasing function of $b-a$ and satisfies

$$\lim_{b-a \rightarrow \infty} \delta = 0.$$

Hence, for any small δ , we can find a corresponding $(0, \delta)$ -differentially private uniform noise. But, it should be pointed out that when the value of $b-a$ increases, the variance of the uniform distribution $(= \frac{(b-a)^2}{12})$ increases.

The above analysis shows how to use the developed theory to determine differential privacy of randomized mechanisms. differential privacy of any noise adding mechanism can be determined




Fig. 4. Uniform noise: $(0, \delta)$ -differentially private.

by examining the conditions in the theory. It is also found that using our theory can obtain the same results for the special cases as those proved in existing work, which verifies the effectiveness of the proposed theory. However, being different from the previous approach, our method does not depend on any fixed distribution of noise, and could be an efficient criterion of differential privacy.

IV. APPLICATION ON PRIVACY-PRESERVING CONSENSUS ALGORITHM

Consensus is an efficient algorithm for distributed computing and control, which refers to the action that nodes in the network reach a global agreement regarding a certain opinion using their local neighbors' information only [14]. Consensus has been applied in a variety of areas, e.g., distributed energy management [15], scheduling [16], and clock synchronization [17]–[19]. Recently, privacy-preserving consensus problem is studied, which aims to guarantee that the privacy of initial state is preserved and at the same time a consensus can still be achieved [20], [22], [24]. The basic idea is to add random noises to the real state value during the communication for privacy preserving, which is the same as (3). Hence, this motivates us to adopt the developed theories in the above section to analyze differential privacy of the privacy-preserving consensus algorithm.

A. Privacy-preserving Consensus Algorithm

A network is abstracted by an undirected and connected graph, $G = (V, E)$, where V is the set of nodes and E is the set of the communication links (edges) between nodes. An edge $(i, j) \in E$ iff nodes i and j can communicate with each other. Let N_i be the neighbor set of node i , defined by $N_i = \{j | j \in V, (i, j) \in E, j \neq i\}$. Let $|V| = n \geq 3$ be the number of nodes in the network and $x_i(0) \in \mathbf{R}$ be the initial state of node i . Let $x(0) = [x_1(0), \dots, x_n(0)]^T \in \Omega_x^0 \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$.

General Consensus Algorithm: For a general consensus algorithm, each node will communicate with its neighbor nodes and update its state based on the received information to obtain a consensus of all initial state values. The dynamic iteration equation is given by

$$x_i(k+1) = w_{ii}x_i(k) + \sum_{j \in N_i} w_{ij}x_j(k), \quad (21)$$

for $\forall i \in V$, which can be written in the matrix form as

$$x(k+1) = Wx(k), \quad (22)$$

where w_{ii} and w_{ij} are weights, and W is the weight matrix. It is well known from [26] that, if, i) $w_{ii} > 0$ and $w_{ij} > 0$; and ii) W is doubly stochastic matrix, then an average can be achieved by (22), i.e.,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x(k) = \frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^n x_\ell(0)}{n} \mathbf{1} = \bar{x}. \quad (23)$$

Privacy-preserving Consensus (PC) Algorithm: When the privacy of nodes' initial states are concerned, each node may be unwilling to release its real state to the neighbor nodes at each iteration. It means that each $x_j(k)$ is unavailable in (21). To preserve the privacy of nodes' initial states, a widely used approach is to add a random noise to the real state when a node needs to communicate with its neighbor nodes [24]. Hence, we introduce a common privacy-preserving consensus algorithm as follows:

$$\mathcal{PC} : \begin{cases} x^+(k) = x(k) + \theta(k) \\ x(k+1) = Wx^+(k) \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

A privacy-preserving average consensus algorithm is to design the adding noise process (including the noise distribution and the correlations among noises in different iterations), such that the goal of (23) is achieved under (24).

B. Privacy Conditions of Consensus

We define the input and the output sequences of each node i in privacy-preserving consensus algorithm (24) until iteration k as

$$\mathcal{I}_{x_i}^{in}(k) = \{x_i(0), \theta_i(0), \dots, \theta_i(k)\}, \quad (25)$$

and

$$\mathcal{I}_{x_i}^{out}(k) = \{x_i^+(0), \dots, x_i^+(k)\}, \quad (26)$$

respectively. Then, $\mathcal{I}_x^{in}(k) = \{x(0), \theta(0), \dots, \theta(k)\}$ is the system input and $\mathcal{I}_x^{out}(k) = \{x^+(0), \dots, x^+(k)\}$ is the system output. Let the information set of the adding noises for node i be $\mathcal{I}_{i_{noise}}^{in}(k) = \{\theta_i(0), \dots, \theta_i(k)\}$. Let $f_{\theta_i(k)}(z)$ be the PDF of $\theta_i(k)$. Then, we have $\text{Range}(\mathcal{PC}) = \Omega_x^0 \oplus \Theta(0) \oplus \dots \oplus \Theta(k) \oplus \dots$, where $\oplus$ denotes the plus of the elements in two sets.

By referring to [22], we introduce the definition of (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy for a consensus algorithm as follows.

Definition 4.1: A PC algorithm (24) is (ϵ, δ) -differentially private if, for any pair x and y of σ -adjacent initial state vector and any set $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n \times \infty}$,

$$\Pr\{\mathcal{I}_x^{out}(\infty) \in \mathcal{O}\} \leq e^\epsilon \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_y^{out}(\infty) \in \mathcal{O}\} + \delta. \quad (27)$$

If $\delta = 0$, we say that (24) is ϵ -differentially private.

First, we give the necessary condition of ϵ -differential privacy for algorithm (24).

Theorem 4.2: If algorithm (24) is ϵ -differentially private, then for $\forall k \geq 0$, the random noise vector $\sum_{l=0}^k W^{k-l} \theta(l)$ should satisfy conditions $c1$ and $c2$.

Proof: Let $\mathcal{O}^{n \times k} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n \times k}$ for $k > 0$ and $\mathcal{O}^{n \times 0} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^n$ for $k = 0$. For any pair x and y of σ -adjacent initial state vector, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_x^{out}(\infty) \in \mathcal{O}\} &\leq e^\epsilon \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_y^{out}(\infty) \in \mathcal{O}\}, \forall \mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n \times \infty} \\ \Leftrightarrow \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_x^{out}(k) \in \mathcal{O}^{n \times k}\} &\leq e^\epsilon \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_y^{out}(k) \in \mathcal{O}^{n \times k}\}, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \forall k \geq 0, \mathcal{O}^{n \times k} &\subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n \times k} \\ \Rightarrow \Pr\{x^+(k) \in \mathcal{O}^{n \times 1}\} &\leq e^\epsilon \Pr\{y^+(k) \in \mathcal{O}^{n \times 1}\}, \\ \forall k \geq 0, \mathcal{O}^{n \times k} &\subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n \times k}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

From (24), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
x^+(k) &= x(k) + \theta(k) \\
&= W[x(k-1) + \theta(k-1)] + \theta(k) \\
&= W^k x(0) + \sum_{l=0}^k W^{k-l} \theta(l) \\
&= x(0) + (W^k - I)x(0) + \sum_{l=0}^k W^{k-l} \theta(l),
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where I is an identity matrix. From (28), (30) and Theorem 3.1, we infer that $(W^k - I)z + \sum_{l=0}^k W^{k-l} \theta(l)$, $z = x, y$ should satisfy conditions $c1$ and $c2$ for any σ -adjacent state vector x and y . It follows that $\sum_{l=0}^k W^{k-l} \theta(l)$ satisfies conditions $c1$ and $c2$. ■

Then, we give the necessary condition of average consensus for algorithm (24).

Theorem 4.3: Using algorithm (24), if

$$\Pr\{\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x(k) = \bar{x}\} = 1, \tag{31}$$

i.e., the average consensus is achieved in probability, then

$$\Pr\{\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} W^{k-l} \theta(l) = 0\} = 1,$$

and $\Pr\{\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} W\theta(k) = 0\} = 1$, i.e., the add noise should equal 0 or be the 0-eigenvector of W when $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof: Under algorithm (24), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x(k) &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[W^k x(0) + \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} W^{k-l} \theta(l) \right] \\
&= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} W^k x(0) + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} W^{k-l} \theta(l) \\
&= \bar{x} + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} W^{k-l} \theta(l),
\end{aligned}$$

where set $\sum_{l=1}^{-1}(\cdot) = 0$. Then, from (31), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\{\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} W^{k-l} \theta(l) = 0\} &= \Pr\{\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} [x(k) - \bar{x}] = 0\} \\
&= 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, note that when $\sum_{l=0}^{k-1} W^{k-l}\theta(l) = 0$, we have $W\theta(\infty) = 0$. Hence, we have $\Pr\{\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} W\theta(k) = 0\} = 1$. $\blacksquare$

Next, by comparing the necessary conditions of ϵ -differential privacy and average consensus, an impossibility result is given as follows.

Impossibility Result: From Theorem 4.3, one infers that the added noise $\theta(k)$ should converge to 0 or the 0-eigenvector of W , denoted by λ_0 , i.e., $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \theta(k) = 0$ or $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \theta(k) = \lambda_0$. Note that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=0}^k W^{k-l}\theta(l) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sum_{l=0}^{k-1} W^{k-l}\theta(l) + \theta(k) \right].$$

Then, we have

$$\Pr\left\{\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=0}^k W^{k-l}\theta(l) = 0 \text{ or } \lambda_0\right\} = 1.$$

Thus, the conditions $c1$ and $c2$ no longer hold for the added noise $\sum_{l=0}^k W^{k-l}\theta(l)$ when $k \rightarrow \infty$. It contradicts to the necessary condition in Theorem 4.2, and thus ϵ -differential privacy cannot be guaranteed. Hence, using (24), nodes cannot simultaneously converge to the average of their initial states and preserve ϵ -differential privacy of their initial states.

Remark 4.4: It should be pointed out that the above impossibility result is first proved by Nozari et al. in [22]. Here, we provide a new proof of the impossibility result by using the framework of differential privacy developed in this paper. From this new proof, it is found that the necessary condition of differential privacy and the necessary condition of average consensus are conflict, which is the root cause of the impossibility result.

Finally, we provide the sufficient conditions of differential privacy for algorithm (24).

Theorem 4.5: Suppose that the noise sequence $\theta(1), \theta(2), \dots, \theta(k), \dots$, is independent from both $\theta(0)$ and $x(0)$. Then, if $\theta(0)$ satisfies conditions $c1$ and $c2$, algorithm (24) provides ϵ -differential privacy; if $\theta(0)$ satisfies (5) or (both (19) and (20) simultaneously), algorithm (24) provides (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy, where $\epsilon \leq \log(c_b)$ and δ satisfies (18) or (is given by (19)).

Proof: Given any $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathbf{R}^{n \times \infty}$, we let $\mathcal{O}_l^\iota$ be the set of the l -th to ι -th column vectors of $\mathcal{O}$

for $l, \iota \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_x^{out}(\infty) \in \mathcal{O}\} \\ &= \Pr\{x^+(0) \in \mathcal{O}_1^1\} \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_x^{out}(1, \infty) \in \mathcal{O}_2^\infty | x^+(0) \in \mathcal{O}_1^1\} \\ &= \oint_{\mathcal{O}_1^1} f_{\theta(0)}(z - x) \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_x^{out}(1, \infty) \in \mathcal{O}_2^\infty | z\} dz \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_y^{out}(\infty) \in \mathcal{O}\} \\ &= \Pr\{y^+(0) \in \mathcal{O}_1^1\} \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_y^{out}(1, \infty) \in \mathcal{O}_2^\infty | y^+(0) \in \mathcal{O}_1^1\} \\ &= \oint_{\mathcal{O}_1^1} f_{\theta(0)}(z - y) \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_y^{out}(1, \infty) \in \mathcal{O}_2^\infty | z\} dz \end{aligned}$$

Since $\theta(1), \theta(2), \dots, \theta(k), \dots$, are independent from both $\theta(0)$ and $x(0)$, for given any same vector z , we have

$$\Pr\{\mathcal{I}_x^{out}(1, \infty) \in \mathcal{O}_2^\infty | z\} = \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_y^{out}(1, \infty) \in \mathcal{O}_2^\infty | z\}.$$

When $\theta(0)$ satisfies conditions $c1$ and $c2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \oint_{\mathcal{O}_1^1} f_{\theta(0)}(z - x) \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_x^{out}(1, \infty) \in \mathcal{O}_2^\infty | z\} dz \\ &= \oint_{\mathcal{O}_1^1} f_{\theta(0)}(z - y + \sigma) \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_x^{out}(1, \infty) \in \mathcal{O}_2^\infty | z\} dz \\ &= \oint_{\mathcal{O}_1^1} f_{\theta_{i_0}(0)}(z_{i_0} - y_{i_0} + \sigma_{i_0}) \prod_{i=1, i \neq i_0}^n f_{\theta_i(0)}(z_i - y_i) \\ & \quad \times \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_x^{out}(1, \infty) \in \mathcal{O}_2^\infty | z\} dz \\ &\leq \oint_{\mathcal{O}_1^1} c_b f_{\theta(0)}(z - y) \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_y^{out}(1, \infty) \in \mathcal{O}_2^\infty | z\} dz, \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma \in \mathbf{R}^n$ is a vector with $\sigma_{i_0} = \sigma$ and all the other elements equal to 0, which means that

$$\Pr\{\mathcal{I}_x^{out}(\infty) \in \mathcal{O}\} \leq e^\epsilon \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_y^{out}(\infty) \in \mathcal{O}\}.$$

Thus, (24) provides ϵ -differential privacy.

When $\theta(0)$ satisfies (5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \oint_{\mathcal{O}_1^1} f_{\theta(0)}(z-x) \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_x^{out}(1, \infty) \in \mathcal{O}_2^\infty | z\} dz \\
& \leq \oint_{\mathcal{O}_1^1} c_b f_{\theta(0)}(z-y) \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_y^{out}(1, \infty) \in \mathcal{O}_2^\infty | z\} dz \\
& \quad + \oint_{\hat{\mathcal{O}}_1^1} f_{\theta(0)}(z-x) \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_y^{out}(1, \infty) \in \mathcal{O}_2^\infty | z\} dz \\
& \leq \oint_{\mathcal{O}_1^1} c_b f_{\theta(0)}(z-y) \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_y^{out}(1, \infty) \in \mathcal{O}_2^\infty | z\} dz \\
& \quad + \oint_{\hat{\mathcal{O}}_1^1} f_{\theta(0)}(z-x) dz
\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_1^1 = \{z | z \in \mathcal{O}_1^1, f_{\theta_{i_0}(0)}(z_{i_0} - y_{i_0}) = 0, f_{\theta_{i_0}(0)}(z_{i_0} - x_{i_0}) \neq 0\}$. Let δ satisfy (18). Then, we have

$$\Pr\{\mathcal{I}_x^{out}(\infty) \in \mathcal{O}\} \leq e^\epsilon \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_y^{out}(\infty) \in \mathcal{O}\} + \delta.$$

Thus, (24) provides (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy.

If $\theta(0)$ satisfies both (19) and (20) simultaneously, then there also exists Θ_0 and Θ_1 such that $\theta(0) + x$ satisfies (19) and (20). Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_x^{out}(\infty) \in \mathcal{O}\} \\
& = \oint_{\mathcal{O}_1^1} f_{\theta(0)}(z-x) \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_x^{out}(1, \infty) \in \mathcal{O}_2^\infty | z\} dz \\
& = \oint_{\mathcal{O}_1^1 \cap \Theta_0} f_{\theta(0)}(z-x) \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_x^{out}(1, \infty) \in \mathcal{O}_2^\infty | z\} dz \\
& \quad + \oint_{\mathcal{O}_1^1 \cap \Theta_1} f_{\theta(0)}(z-x) \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_x^{out}(1, \infty) \in \mathcal{O}_2^\infty | z\} dz \\
& \leq \oint_{\Theta_0} f_{\theta(0)}(z-x) dz \\
& \quad + c_b \oint_{\mathcal{O}_1^1 \cap \Theta_1} f_{\theta(0)}(z-y) \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_y^{out}(1, \infty) \in \mathcal{O}_2^\infty | z\} dz \\
& \leq \delta + \log(c_b) \Pr\{\mathcal{I}_y^{out}(\infty) \in \mathcal{O}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

It means that (24) provides (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy.

Thus, we have completes the proof. ■

Based on the above theoretical results, it is not difficult to analyze differential privacy of the existing privacy-preserving consensus algorithm. For example, in [21], [22], the privacy-preserving

consensus algorithms are designed by adding independent and exponentially decaying Laplacian noise to the consensus process, and thus the sufficient conditions in Theorem 4.5 are satisfied. Hence, these privacy-preserving consensus algorithms proposed in [21], [22] are ϵ -differentially private, while the exact average consensus cannot be guaranteed by these algorithms. In [24], the exponentially decaying and zero-sum normal noises are adopted in the privacy-preserving consensus algorithm. Since the sum of all added noises equals 0, the necessary condition in Theorem 4.2 cannot be satisfied. Hence, the algorithm proposed in [24] is not ϵ -differentially private, however it can achieve the exact average consensus in the mean-square sense. The above results are consistent with those proved in the corresponding papers.

V. RELATED WORKS

The concept of differential privacy (including ϵ -differential privacy and (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy) was first introduced by Dwork et al. [2], [5]. After then, differential privacy has attracted substantial attention throughout computer, control and communication science, including areas like deep learning [10], optimization [8], [9], dynamic systems [20] and more. There are also some other privacy definitions, e.g., identifiability and mutual-information privacy, and we refer the readers to the paper [27] by Wang et al. to view the relationship among these privacy concepts.

Dwork et al. [2] showed that the Laplacian mechanism, i.e., adding random noise with Laplace distribution proportional to the global sensitivity of the query function to perturb the query output, can preserve ϵ -differential privacy. Also, McSherry and Talwar [12] showed the exponential mechanism can preserve ϵ -differential privacy for general query functions. It is shown that adding random noise with Gaussian distribution can preserve the (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy for both real valued query functions [5] and infinite dimensional query functions [13]. For the work on enforcing differential privacy in optimization, linear programs are solved in a framework that allows for keeping objective functions or constraints private [7]. This work was extended by the authors of [8], and they considered a similar setting wherein some affine objectives with linearly constrained problems are solved while keeping the privacy of the objective functions. To keep inputs private from an adversary observing a system's outputs, differential privacy has been adapted to dynamical systems, which introduces the privacy concerns in the context of systems theory [20].

Recently, privacy issues are concerned in multi-agent systems, and mainly investigate the privacy-preserving consensus problem. The objective is aiming to guarantee the agents initial states (or objective functions) private and average consensus to be achieved [9], [20]–[24]. In [9], the authors solved distributed consensus problems while keeping the agents' objective functions private, and in [21] the same authors solved similar problems while keeping the privacy of each agent's initial state. In these works, differential privacy is guaranteed by adding the independently and exponentially decaying Laplacian noises to the consensus process. More recently, Nozari et al. [22] obtained and proved an interesting impossibility result that achieving average consensus and differential privacy simultaneously is impossible by contradiction via the definition of differential privacy. This result is also proved in this paper by comparing the necessary conditions of differential privacy and of the average consensus.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we provided a theoretical framework of differential privacy for a general random noise mechanism. We obtained the fundamental conditions for determining differential privacy of random noise mechanism, followed by an application study on privacy-preserving consensus algorithm. Specifically, considering a general random noise adding mechanism, we obtained a necessary and sufficient condition of ϵ -differential privacy, and two useful sufficient conditions of (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy of the noise adding mechanism. We also provided the estimations of the upper bounds of the parameters ϵ and δ . Then, we showed that the obtained theoretical framework provides efficient and simple criteria of differential privacy using case studies. In addition, we applied the obtained result to obtain the necessary condition and the sufficient condition for the privacy-preserving consensus algorithm, under which differential privacy is achieved.

There are still many open issues worth further investigation. For example, in this paper, we focus only on the privacy analysis, but do not consider the accuracy of queries from statistical databases under the random noise adding mechanism. How the distribution of the adding noise affect the accuracy of queries needs further investigation. Meanwhile, the relationship between the parameters in differential privacy (ϵ and δ), the parameters of the PDF of the adding noise (mean and variance) also needs further investigation. In addition, Cuff and Yu [28] recently introduced a novel privacy concept, named mutual-information differential privacy (MIDP),

which is sandwiched between ϵ -differential privacy and (ϵ, δ) -differential privacy in terms of its strength. MIDP depicts differential privacy from the perspective of information theory. Thus, how to extend our results under MIDP is also an interesting issue, which will be left as the future works.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. He and L. Cai, "Differential private noise adding mechanism: basic conditions and its applicationin," *Proc. of IEEE ACC*, submitted, 2017.
- [2] C. Dwork, "Differential privacy," in *Automata, languages and programming*, Springer, 1-12, 2006.
- [3] Q. Geng and P. Viswanath, "The optimal noise-adding mechanism in differential privacy," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(2): 925-951, 2016.
- [4] Q. Geng and P. Viswanath, "Optimal noise adding mechanisms for approximate differential privacy," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(2): 952-969, 2016.
- [5] C. Dwork, "Differential privacy: A survey of results," in *Theory and Applications of Models of Computation, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, M. Agrawal, D. Du, Z. Duan, and A. Li, Eds. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1-19, 2008.
- [6] C. Dwork and A. Roth, "The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy," *Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science*, 9(3-4), 211-407, 2014.
- [7] J. Hsu, A. Roth, T. Roughgarden, and J. Ullman, "Privately solving linear programs," in *Automata, Languages, and Programming*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, J. Esparza, P. Fraigniaud, T. Husfeldt, and E. Koutsoupias, Eds. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2014.
- [8] S. Han, U. Topcu, and G. Pappas, "Differentially private convex optimization with piecewise affine objectives," in *Proc. of IEEE CDC*, 2014.
- [9] Z. Huang, S. Mitra, and N. Vaidya, "Differentially private distributed optimization," in *Proc. of ACM ICDCN*, 2015.
- [10] M. Abadi, A. Chu, I. Goodfellow, H. McMahan, I. Mironov, K. Talwar, and L. Zhang, "Deep Learning with differential rivity," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.00133*, 2016.
- [11] G. Barthe, M. Gaboardi, B. Gregoire, J. Hsu, and P. Strub, "Advanced probabilistic couplings for differential privacy," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.07143*, 2016.
- [12] F. McSherry, and Talwar, "Mechanism design via differential privacy," in *Proc. IEEE FOCS*, 2007.
- [13] R. Hall, A. Rinaldo, and L. Wasserman, "Differential privacy for functions and functional data," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14(2): 703-727, 2013.
- [14] R. Olfati-Saber, J. A. Fax, and R. M. Murray, "Consensus and cooperation in networked multi-agent systems," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 95(1): 215-233, 2007.
- [15] C. Zhao, J. He, P. Cheng and J. Chen, "Consensus-based energy management in smart grid with transmission losses and directed communication," *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid*, DOI: 10.1109/TSG.2015.2513772, 2015.
- [16] J. He, L. Duan, F. Hou, P. Cheng, and J. Chen, "Multi-period scheduling for wireless sensor networks: A distributed consensus approach," *IEEE Trans. on Signal Processing*, 63(7): 1651-1663, 2015.
- [17] L. Schenato and F. Fiorentin, "Average timesynch: A consensus-based protocol for clock synchronization in wireless sensor networks," *Automatica*, 47(9): 1878-1886, 2011.

- [18] R. Carli, and S. Zampieri, "Network clock synchronization based on the second order linear consensus algorithm," *IEEE Trans Automat. Contr.*, 59(2): 409–422, 2014.
- [19] J. He, P. Cheng, L. Shi, and J. Chen, "Time synchronization in WSNs: A maximum value based consensus approach," *IEEE Trans Automat. Contr.*, 59(3): 660–674, 2014.
- [20] J. Le Ny and G. Pappas, "Differentially private filtering," *IEEE Trans Automat. Contr.*, 59(2): 341–354, 2014.
- [21] Z. Huang, S. Mitra, and G. Dullerud, "Differentially private iterative synchronous consensus." in *Proc. ACM workshop on Privacy in the electronic society*, 2012.
- [22] E. Nozari, P. Tallapragada, and J. Cortes, "Differentially private average consensus: Obstructions, trade-offs, and optimal algorithm design." *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.09039*, 2016.
- [23] N. Maniara and C. Hadjicostis, "Privacy-preserving asymptotic average consensus." in *Proc. IEEE ECC*, 2013.
- [24] Y. Mo, and R. Murray, "Privacy preserving average consensus," *IEEE Trans Automat Contr.*, to appear, 2016.
- [25] M. DeGroot, "Reaching a consensus," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 69(345), 118–121, 1974.
- [26] A. Olshevsky and J. Tsitsiklis, "Convergence speed in distributed consensus and averaging," *SIAM Review*, 53(4): 747–772, 2011.
- [27] W. Wang, L. Ying, and J. Zhang, "On the relation between identifiability, differential privacy, and mutual-information privacy," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, to appear, 2016.
- [28] P. Cuff and L. Yu, "Differential privacy as a mutual information constraint," in *Proc. ACM CCS*, 2016.